

**REMARKS**

By way of the present response, claims 1, 3, 5, 11, 13, 15, 21, 23 and 25 are amended and claims 2, 12 and 22 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 3-11, 13-21 and 23-30 remain pending. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims.

In the office action, claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-15, 17-20, 22-25, and 27-30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11 and 21 to include the indicated allowable subject matter of now canceled claims 2, 12 and 22, respectively. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the claims be removed.

Starting on page 2 the office action, claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 21 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,734,802 to Maltz et al. (Maltz) and claims 1, 6, 11, 21 and 26 stand rejected under U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,744,534 to Balasubramanian et al. (Balasubramanian). With respect to independent claims 1, 11 and 21, the Office asserts that Maltz discloses defining a finite set of document rendering intents (hue, saturation, and luminance of graphical and pictorial objects) as a basis for document rendering, expressing at least one desired document rendering strategy comprising a first combination of the document rendering intents (using a blend of look-up tables for color mapping), and associating the at least one desired document rendering strategy with at least one rendering decision associated with a document (decision based on whether image signal are outside the pictorial gamut). See abstract and col. 4, lines 37-67 and col. 5, lines 32-49.

Further with regard to claims 1, 11 and 21, the Office asserts that Balasubramanian discloses defining a finite set of document rendering intents as a basis for document rendering, expressing at least one desired document rendering strategy comprising a first combination of the document rendering intents (using a blend of color mapping transforms), and associating the at least one desired document rendering strategy with at least one rendering decision associated with a document (decision based on where a pixel is

located in the device or pictorial gamut). See abstract and col. 3, line 66 to col. 4, line 21, and col. 6, line 56 to col. 7, line 40.

However, as mentioned above, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11 and 21 to recite, *inter alia*, the indicated allowable subject matter of “wherein the defining a finite set of document rendering intents further comprises defining a finite set of color gamut mapping intents, wherein the expressing at least one desired document rendering strategy further comprises expressing at least one desired color gamut mapping strategy comprising a second combination of the gamut mapping intents, and wherein the associating the at least one desired document rendering strategy with at least one rendering decision associated with a document further comprises associating the at least one desired color gamut mapping strategy with at least one color in an input color gamut associated with the document.” Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the 102 rejections be withdrawn.

The system and method for device-independent color gamut mapping set forth in Applicant’s claims recognizes that a finite set of color gamut mapping intents form the basis for performing color gamut mappings during document rendering and implements a color mapping method for each of the color gamut mapping intents. For each color in a document to be rendered, the system obtains a desired color gamut mapping strategy expressed as a combination of the color gamut mapping intents and performs each of the color mapping methods on each color to obtain basis color maps for each color. The system then constructs a mapped color for each of the colors in the document based on the desired color gamut mapping strategy associated with each color. Furthermore, weight values may be used to further define the combination in the desired color gamut mapping strategy. The Maltz and Balasubramanian patents do not describe such a system or method, and thus do not suggest the advantageous features of the presently claimed subject matter.

In view of all of the foregoing, Applicant submits that this case is in condition for allowance and such allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 21, 2007

/Sean A. Pryor, Reg. #48103/  
Sean A. Pryor

**NIXON PEABODY LLP**

Clinton Square, P.O. Box 31051

Rochester, New York 14603-1051

Telephone: (585) 263-1014

Facsimile: (585) 263-1600